



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/840,023 | 04/24/2001 | Sung Lyong Lee | Q62058 | 4249 |

7590 09/05/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

NATNAEL, PAULO S M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2614

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/840,023

Applicant(s)

LEE, SUNG LYONG

Examiner

Paulos M. Natnael

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and 2, the phrase "by giving each peculiar ID in at least more than one OSD object unit" is not clear whether it's referring to a separate object unit or the object data, rendering the claim indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **1-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrison, U.S. Pat. No. 6,591,292 in view of Cheney et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,519,283.

Claim **1** is a method claim of claim 2 and, thus, Claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as claim **2**.

Considering claim 2, Morrison discloses the following claimed subject matter, note;

a) an OSD source remote controller for generating an OSD object display command on a screen is met by Remote Controller 125, fig.2, which the user utilizes to enable an EPG which in response the Controller 115 produces a signal OSD-RGB. (see col. 7, lines 63-67 and col. 8, line 66 through col. 9, line 10)

OSD DISPLAY data a

b) an OSD source for transmitting OSD display data by giving each peculiar ID in at least more than one OSD object unit and transmitting an OSD object ID and display location information if there is an OSD object display command from said OSD source remote controller, is met by the transport System 25, Fig.2;

Except for;

c) a display apparatus for storing at least more than one OSD object display data received from said OSD source in a memory, reading OSD object display data having a corresponding ID from the memory in response to received OSD object ID and display location information, and displaying OSD object display data on a screen.

Regarding c), Morrison discloses separate storage devices 90 and 105 but does not disclose the details of a display device as comprising a storage, or memory, or buffer. However, it is well known in the art that display devices comprise such storage devices.

In that regard, Cheney et al. discloses an integrated video processing system having multiple video sources and implementing pictures-in-picture with on-screen display graphics. Cheney discloses a video display device (Fig.6) comprising video

Art Unit: 2614

buffer 684, MPEG decoder 654, memory control unit 652, etc. It would have been obvious, therefore, for those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morrison et al. by providing the display device given in fig.6 of Cheney in order to display blended video signal read from the memory or display buffer.

Considering claim 3, the OSD object display apparatus of claim 2, wherein the OSD source comprises:

- a) an MPEG source for supplying a detected MPEG transport stream to the display apparatus, is met by the transport decode 55, fig.2;
- b) an OSD generator for generating OSD display data in bitmap format, is met by the controller 115, fig.2;
- c) a register for storing data, is met by the Packet Buffer 60, fig.2;
- c) a controller for controlling the MPEG source, the OSD generator, and the register, is met by system controller 115 as well.

Considering claim 4, the OSD object display apparatus according to claim 3, wherein the register is an output asynchronous plug register;

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner takes Official Notice in that the output asynchronous plug register, although not disclosed by Morrison, is well known in the art and would have been obvious to the skilled in the art to modify the system of Morrison

to provide the plug register so that the data can be received and retrieved asynchronously.

Considering claim 5, a command input part for receiving a command signal from the OSD source remote controller and providing the command signal to the controller, is met by the remote input interface 120, fig.2.

Considering claim 6, the OSD object display apparatus of claim 2, wherein the display apparatus comprises: an MPEG decoder for decoding an MPEG transport stream and outputting image data; a buffer for buffering OSD data; an overlapper for overlapping the image data and the OSD data and providing overlapped data to the screen; and a controller for controlling the MPEG decoder, the buffer, the overlapper, the memory, and the screen.

Regarding claim 6, see rejection of claim 1(c).

Considering claim 7, the OSD object display apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the OSD object display apparatus further comprises: a display apparatus remote controller.

Regarding claim 7, Morrison discloses remote control unit for the system shown in fig.2. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice in that a remote controller for a display apparatus is well known in the art and would have been obvious to the skilled in

Art Unit: 2614

the art to modify the system of Morrison by providing such a controller in order to make it easier for the user to operate the system.

Considering claim 8, a command input part for receiving a command signal from the display apparatus remote controller and providing the command signal to the 5 controller.

Regarding claim 8, Morrison discloses remote unit interface for the system shown in fig.2. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice in that an interface for remote controller for a display apparatus is well known in the art and would have been obvious to the skilled in the art to modify the system of Morrison by providing such a controller interface or a command input in order to make it easier for the operator to operate the system.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Bruck et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,008,836 discloses a method and system for adjusting television display control using a browser comprising WebTV box 10 and television set 12, fig.2;

Ludtke U.S. Pat. No. 6,460,030 discloses a method and system for searching through descriptive data in the AV/C protocol which shows a network comprising a television set, PC, receiver, VCR and controller device 12.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paulos M. Natnael whose telephone number is (703) 305-0019. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am -3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.


MICHAEL H. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Paulos Natnael *pmw*
August 21, 2003